

REMARKS

1. In response to the final Office Action mailed April 18, 2006, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 66-103 were last presented for examination in this application. In the Office Action, claims 66-103 were rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 66, 69, 72-73, 81, 84, 87, 88, 96, 99, 102 and 103 have been amended. No claim have been cancelled or added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 66-103 will remain pending in this application. Of these thirty-eight (38) claims, three (3) claims (claims 66, 81 and 96) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

Art of Record

2. Applicant acknowledges receipt of form PTO-892 identifying additional references made of record by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections

3. Independent claims 66 , 81 and 96 and dependent claims 67-69, 80, 82-84, 95, and 97-99 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,263,290 to Williams, *et al.* (hereinafter, “Williams”). Dependent claims 70-78, 85-93 and 100-103 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,003,248 to Johnson (hereinafter, “Johnson”). Dependent claims 79 and 94 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of Johnson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,617 to Kidd, *et al.* (hereinafter, “Kidd”). Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

4. Independent claim 66, recites, in part, “generate at least one pulse measurement for each of a plurality of different pulse measurement types for each of a plurality of pulses in a time-varying analog signal stored in an acquisition memory.”

5. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner relied on a time tag list of Williams as allegedly disclosing a generated pulse measurement of a particular measurement type. (*See,*

Office Action at 2.) Williams discloses that this time tag list is used to display occurrences of a single event of interest as well as statistics for this single event of interest. (*See*, Williams at col. 3 lns. 29-30.) Williams discloses that this event of interest may be the time at which a voltage crosses a threshold. (*See*, Williams at col. 7 lns 57-61; col. 4 lns 6-13.) For example, in the example of Williams, this time tag list includes the list of times representing the relative time at which the waveform of interest crossed a select voltage threshold with positive slope. (*See*, Williams, col. 8 lns 57-61.) Accordingly, this time tag list of Williams does not teach generating measurements for a plurality of different pulse measurement types, but is rather merely for a single event of interest, such as the times when a voltage crosses a threshold.

6. In addition, to disclosing a time tag list for an event of interest (e.g., the times a voltage crosses a threshold), Williams also discloses selecting a parameter to be analyzed. (*See*, Williams, col. 7 lns 63-64.) These parameters to be analyzed may be pulse width, period, frequency, or delay. (*See*, Williams, col. 7 lns 64-65.) However, Williams does not disclose generating measurements for a plurality of different parameters. Rather, Williams only discloses selecting one parameter (e.g., period, pulse width) for analysis.

7. Applicant therefore respectfully submit that amended independent claim 66 is allowable over Williams for at least the reason that Williams fails to teach or suggest “generate at least one pulse measurement for each of a plurality of different pulse measurement types for each of a plurality of pulses in a time-varying analog signal stored in an acquisition memory.” Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection to claim 66 for at least this reason.

8. Applicant also respectfully submits that amended independent claim 66 is allowable over Williams for at least the following additional reason. Claim 66, as amended, recites “store in a data structure the generated at least one pulse measurement for each of the plurality of different pulse measurement types and the at least one measurement statistic.”

9. In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner alleged that Williams discloses storing a pulse measurement and at least one measurement statistic. In support, the Examiner cited to portions of Williams not relied on in the prior Office Action, col. 6 ln. 53-col. 7 ln 32 and col. 8 lns 44-63, for allegedly disclosing storing at least one pulse measurement and at least one pulse measurement statistic. (*See*, Office Action at 11.) These newly relied on portions disclose a measurement system that acquires signals from a system under test that are

converted into an information record, which may be a computer file. (*See*, Williams, col. 6 lns 63- col. 7 ln. 15.) This information record includes a series of voltages represented as discrete digital signals. (*See*, Williams, col. 7 lns 16-18.)

10. Williams also discloses, as noted above, generating a time tag list for a particular event of interest. (*See*, Williams, col. 8 lns 54-55.) In the example disclosed by Williams, this time tag list includes the list of times representing the relative time at which the waveform of interest crossed a select voltage threshold with positive slope. (*See*, Williams, col. 8 lns 57-61.) As such, the information record and time tag list are each separate objects. Additionally, each only store one particular type of measurement, where the information record stores voltages and the time tag list stores times at which a particular event occurred. Thus, neither the information record nor time tag list of Williams disclose a data structure storing pulse measurements for each of a plurality of different pulse measurement types.

11. Applicant therefore respectfully submit that claim 66 is allowable over Williams for at least the additional reason that Williams fails to teach or suggest storing “in a data structure the generated at least one pulse measurement for each of the plurality of different pulse measurement types and the at least one measurement statistic.” Applicant accordingly respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection to claim 66 for at least this additional reason.

12. Independent claims 81 and 96, as amended, include similar recitations to those discussed above. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that independent claims 81 and 96 are likewise allowable over Williams for at least similar reasons to those discussed above.

Dependent Claims

13. The dependent claims incorporate all of the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them *a fortiori* independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections of the dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

14. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael G. Verga
Reg. No. 39,410

June 14, 2006